

REMARKS

The above amendments and the following remarks are fully and completely responsive to the Office Action dated December 14, 2004. By this Amendment, claims 9 and 11 have been canceled and claims 1 and 4-6 have been amended. Accordingly, claims 1-8, 10 and 12-20 are pending in this application. In the outstanding Office Action, claims 4-6 were objected to for informalities and claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) (four different rejections). No new matter has been added. Claims 1-8, 10 and 12-20 are presented for consideration.

Claim Objections

Claims 4-6 were objected to for informalities. Claims 4-6 have been amended to correct these informalities. Accordingly, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to claims 4-6.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1, 2, 7 and 9-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Taniguchi et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0058066, "Taniguchi") in view of Ella (U.S. Patent No. 5,872,493).

Claims 3-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Taniguchi in view of Ella and further in view of Watanabe et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,731,046, "Watanabe").

Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Taniguchi in view of Ella and further in view of Lakin (U.S. Patent No. 5,942,958).

Claims 19 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Taniguchi in view of Ella and further in view of Misawa et al. (European Patent Application No. 1,076,414 A2, "Misawa").

Claim 1, as amended, recites in part:

wherein the area of each of the first pad parts is one to six times larger than the placement area of each corresponding one of the bumps, and wherein the transmission paths are formed on a die-attach face of the package.

The above recited structural limitations bring about the advantages described at page 13, lines 5 to 34 of the original specification.

In contrast, Taniguchi fails to teach or suggest any limitation on the relationship in size between the pads and bumps. Ella discloses pads 102a and 102b that are smaller than the bumps 114. Accordingly, when the teachings of Ella are combined with those of Taniguchi, those skilled in the art would take the bump connections taught by Ella into consideration and therefore employ pads 102a and 102b that are smaller than bumps 114.

Taniguchi explicitly teaches that microstrip lines 45 to 49 are not provided in the die-attach portion. Specification paragraph 0095. Similarly, Taniguchi in paragraph 0113 also states that "no microstrip lines are provided in the die-attach portion". Furthermore, in claim 9, Taniguchi recites "said microstrip line is disposed in the package at the position other than the position of said die-attach portion".

Neither Watanabe, Larkin, nor Misawa et al. are cited for or correct the above deficiencies in the combination of Taniguchi and Ella.

Consequently, the cited references fail to teach or suggest the claimed invention. Specifically, these references fail to teach and/or suggest "transmission paths being

formed on a die-attach face of the package” and “the area of each of the first pad parts is one to six times larger than the placement area of each corresponding one of the bumps”. Therefore, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1-8, 10 and 12-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) (four different rejections).

Conclusion

Applicants’ remarks have overcome the rejections set forth in the Office Action dated December 14, 2004. Specifically, Applicants’ remarks have distinguished claims 1-8, 10, and 12-20 from the cited prior art and thus, overcome the rejections of these claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) (four different rejections). Accordingly, claims 1-8, 10, and 12-20 are in condition for allowance. Therefore, Applicants request reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-8, 10 and 12-20.

Applicants submit that the application is now in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes the application is not in condition for allowance, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner contact the undersigned attorney by telephone if it is believed that such contact will expedite the prosecution of the application.

In the event that this paper is not considered to be timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge payment for any additional fees which may be required with respect to this paper to our Deposit Account No. 01-2300, making reference to attorney docket number 025720-00012.

Respectfully submitted,
ARENT FOX PLLC



Rustan J. Hill
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 37,351

Customer No. 004372
ARENT FOX PLLC
1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.,
Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20036-5339
Tel: (202) 857-6000
Fax: (202) 638-4810

RJH/elz:elp
288824_1.DOC